REMARKS

Amendments to the specification have been made to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors.

Claims 15, 17, 18, and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 15 and 36 have been amended to recite the elements of their parent claims and are now independent. Claim 17 as original written is in independent form. Claim 18 depends on claim 17. Therefore claims 17 and 18 do not need to be rewritten. Claims 15, 17, 18, and 36 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-14, 16, 19-35, and 37-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claims 24-25, 37-38, and 45-46 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 8, 12, 14, 15, 19, 28, 34, 36, 40-44, and 47-50 have been amended.

Claims 1-23, 26-36, 39-44, and 47-50 remain in this application.

Examiner Interview

An Examiner Interview took place by telephone with Examiner Thomas Ho and Emmanuel Rivera on April 8, 2004.

It was pointed out that claim 17 as originally written is in independent form, and that claim 18 depends from claim 17. Claims 15 and 36 will be amended as independent claims to include the limitations of the rejected claims. Amended claims 15 and 36 are presented in the listing of claims section of this response.

The Office has rejected claims 1-14, 16, 19-35, and 37-50 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated based on U.S. Patent 5,907,621 to Bachman et al (Bachman).

Mr. Rivera pointed out that independent claims 1, 8, 42, 43, 49, and 50 recite a "token using one-way encryption". One-way encryption particularly provides for an encryption scheme that encrypts an object (e.g., token) such that it cannot be decrypted, either by the receiver, sender, or any other party.

It was presented that the specification describes a distinction between one-way encryption schemes and typical two-way encryption schemes which allow decryption of the object (e.g., token). One-way encryption is used to deter malevolent parties (including the receiver) from the ability of decrypting the token and modifying the token.

Furthermore, it was discussed that it is well known in the art that there is a distinction and difference between one-way and two-way encryption. Specific reference was made to "Applied Cryptography" by Bruce Schneier. Examiner Ho was referred to page 29 of Schneier that describes one-way encryption or one-way functions.

It was further presented that Bachman specifically describes that the token be allowed to be decrypted. Examiner Ho was referred to col. 6, lines 22 to 26 of Bachman which states "[A]t the server, the server program passes the submission through to the session object where *the token is decrypted* at block 423 to expose a multi-byte field of token information including an index". Bachman not only describes that the token is decrypted, but relies that the token be decrypted in order for the server to expose the token information. Therefore, a token that cannot be decrypted is of no use and counterintuitive to what is disclosed or suggested in Bachman.

It was agreed by Examiner Ho that Bachman did show decryption of the token which is provided in two-way encryption schemes. Bachman does not show

one-way encryption which prevents the decryption of the token. It was agreed that the language "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted" is not disclose or suggested by Bachman.

Therefore to distinguish the claims from Bachman, the independent claims are amended to recite "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted" as suggested by Examiner Ho. Examiner Ho agreed that this language overcomes the Bachman reference; however, Examiner Ho required additional searching to determine if the claims as presented are allowable.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-14, 16, 19-35, and 37-50

Claims 1-14, 16, 19-35, and 37-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,907,621 to Bachman et al (Bachman). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1, for example, recites

> A session-state management method comprising:
>
> generating an encoded session-state token, wherein the token incorporates a representation of session state of a client;
>
> encrypting the encoded token to produce an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted; and
>
> sending the encrypted token to the client.

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted. Therefore amended claim 1 is allowable over Bachman.

lee@hayes pllc 509-324-9256 23 MS# 134651.1 G:\MS1-0465us\MS1-489US_M01.doc

PAGE 26/31 * RCVD AT 5/5/2004 1:40:12 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:509 323 8979 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-52

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-7 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 2-7 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 8 recites in part "token that cannot be decrypted".

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest a "token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended claim 8 is allowable over Bachman.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 9-15, and 16 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 8. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 9-15, and 16 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 19 recites in part "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted".

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended claim 19 is allowable over Bachman.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 20-27 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 19. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 20-27 be withdrawn.

lee@hayes pllc 509-324-9256

24

MS# 154651.1 G:\MSI-0\489url\MSI-489US.MOI.doc

PAGE 27/31 * RCVD AT 5/5/2004 1:40:12 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:509 323 8979 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-52

Amended independent claim 28 recites in part "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted".

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended claim 28 is allowable over Bachman.

Dependent claims 29-33 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 28. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 29-33 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 34 recites in part "an encoded session-sate token that cannot be decrypted".

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest "an encoded session-sate token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended claim 34 is allowable over Bachman.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 34 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 35-39 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 34. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 35-39 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 40 recites in part "an encoded token that cannot be decrypted".

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest "an encoded token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended claim 40 is allowable over Bachman.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 40 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 41 is allowable by virtue of its dependency on base claim 40. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 41 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 42 and 43 recite in part "token that cannot be decrypted".

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest "token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended claims 42 and 43 are allowable over Bachman.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 42 and 43 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 44 recites in part "a token that cannot be decrypted".

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest "a token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended claim 44 is allowable over Bachman.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 44 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 45-46 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 44. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 45-46 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 47-50 recite in part "token that cannot be decrypted".

As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman does not disclose or suggest "token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended claims 47-50 are allowable over Bachman.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 47-50 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-23, 26-36, 39-44, and 47-50 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 5/5/04

By: _____
Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245

28